

Gallobelgicus typicus, sp. n.

Ochraceous; hemelytra pale fuscous brown, with the veins ochraceous; second joint of antennæ narrowly creamy white at base and apex; eyes black; femora obscurely fuscously annulate near apices, structural characters as in generic diagnosis.

Long. 5 mm.

Hab. Ceylon; Peradeniya (*E. E. Green*).

LIV.—*Note on the Type Specimen of the Bat Micronycteris microtis*, Miller. By MARCUS W. LYON, Jun.

MICRONYCTERIS MICROTIS was described by Mr. Gerrit S. Miller, Jun.*, in 1898 from a single specimen, which is still the only one known, in the collection of the United States National Museum. Dr. Knud Andersen † has recently raised the question as to whether the ears of the type are damaged. The following history of the type, part of which was probably not known to Mr. Miller, and remarks on the ears may prove of interest.

The specimen, an adult male, now a skin and skull, U.S. National Museum number ¹⁶³⁶⁵₂₃₃₆₁, was collected at Greytown, Nicaragua, by Dr. L. F. H. Birt; date of collecting not known. It was entered in the National Museum Catalogue on February 2, 1889, as an alcoholic, and the skull was catalogued on April 16, 1889. There is no record showing at what time the alcoholic was made into a skin. The wing-membranes are considerably torn and some hair has slipped from the lower back and abdomen, but otherwise the skin is in good condition. The skull is perfect. The colour-value of the skin is much lessened by the fact that it was immersed for an unknown time in alcohol or other preserving fluid. The basal portions of the hairs of *Micronycteris megalotis* are pure white. They were probably so in *M. microtis*, but the preserving fluid has apparently darkened them to a dirty white. The ears of the type of *M. microtis* measure, from meatus to apex, 12 mm., and the greatest breadth is 8 mm. The corresponding measurements in the skin of an adult male, U.S. National Museum Catalogue number 102913, from La Guaira, Venezuela, are 20 mm. and 12 mm. respec-

* Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia, 1898, p. 328 (July 12, 1898).

† Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. ser. 7, vol. xviii. (July 1906) p. 55, footnote.

tively. I have examined the ears of the single specimen of *M. microtis* very carefully, and can find no evidences of singeing or other apparent injury that might have caused them to shrink from 20 mm. to 12 mm. In places about $\frac{1}{2}$ mm. of the ear has been rolled or folded on itself, giving the margin of the ear a heavier appearance than in that of *M. megalotis*. The outer surface of the ear of *M. microtis* is furred about one-half the distance from the base to the tip, and in *M. megalotis* the furring extends about one-third that distance. I can detect no essential differences between the skulls of the two species. The forearm of *M. microtis*, as already noted by Miller and Andersen, is considerably shorter than that of the Mexican form of *M. megalotis* and a little smaller than in Venezuelan examples of the typical race. The same is true of the tibia and foot.

[I am glad that my note on *Micronycteris microtis*, Miller, in the July number of the 'Annals' has induced Dr. Lyon to give the above interesting details on the type specimen. But I must admit that I still do not feel satisfied that the extraordinarily small ears of this example are in their natural condition. I am all the more inclined to doubt on this point as (in addition to the case referred to in my paper, p. 55, footnote) I have recently seen another very striking instance of shrinkage of the ears in a bat: in a series of *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* from Ireland, kindly shown me a few months ago by Major Barrett Hamilton, the ear-conches of *all* examples, without exception, had shrunk to little more than half their natural size; the specimens were *preserved in alcohol* and in other respects undamaged. With their small ears they looked very strange indeed, and I cannot help thinking that if this series of bats had not been the well-known *P. pipistrellus*, but, say, a *Micronycteris*; if they had not come from Ireland, but, say, from Central America, from which material for comparison is considerably scarcer; they might easily have been described as a readily distinguishable new species, and—in view both of the very great difference in the size of the ears of these specimens as compared with individuals in a normal state of preservation, and of the fact that in this case not a single specimen only was available, but a series of individuals all exhibiting the same peculiarity—the mistake would have been very excusable. One statement in Miller's description of *M. microtis*—confirmed by Lyon—seems to me worth emphasizing, viz. that *the skull does not differ appreciably from that of M. megalotis*; it is, of course, not decisive evidence that *microtis* is not specifically distinct from *mega-*

lotis, but—taken together with the fact that also externally, apart from the size of the ears, there is no difference worth mentioning between *microtis* and *megalotis* (for even the colour of the single skin of *microtis*, on which Miller laid some stress in his description, is, according to Lyon, unreliable)—it certainly looks rather suspicious.

My argument is, briefly summed up, this:—As in two British Museum specimens of *Micronycteris hirsuta* (98. 10. 9. 13–14), preserved in alcohol, the ears, for some reason or other, have shrunk far below their natural size (my paper, *l. s. c.*); as in a series of Irish *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, preserved in alcohol, recently shown to me, the ears, for some reason or other, have shrunk to little more than half their natural size; so, the only specimen known of *Micronycteris microtis*, which differs from *M. megalotis* in no essential external character but its curiously small ears, and the skull and dentition of which are indistinguishable from those of *M. megalotis*, may, very likely, be an example of this latter species with much shrunk ears. Whether my assumption is right or wrong cannot, I believe, be definitely proved, until further material is forthcoming from the type locality of *M. microtis*. If it is wrong, the case will stand as follows: the genus *Micronycteris*, as restricted by me, numbers four species; three of these (*M. megalotis*, *minuta*, *hirsuta*) have the ears proportionately quite of the same size, but differ in many important cranial, dental, and external characters; the fourth species (*M. microtis*) has extraordinarily small ears, *but is otherwise practically indistinguishable, cranially, dentally, and externally, from M. megalotis!* All is possible, but strange as the characters of this latter “species” look to me, I still think it safer, for the present, to leave the question as to its validity open to doubt.—KNUD ANDERSEN.]

LV.—*Descriptions of new Pyralidæ of the Subfamilies Hydrocampinæ and Scoparianæ.* By Sir GEORGE F. HAMPSON, Bart., B.A., F.Z.S., &c.

THE following paper is supplementary to my classification of these two subfamilies in the Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond. 1897, pp. 127–240, and the numbers prefixed to the species indicate their position in the genera there dealt with.